

REMARKS

After the foregoing amendment, claims 22-42, as amended, are pending in the application. Claims 22, 35 and 39 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to specific figures in the application, stating that rectangular boxes (and/or circles and triangular boxes) shown in the drawings should be provided with descriptive text labels. Applicant respectfully traverse the objection.

37 C.F.R. § 1.83 states that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. 37 C.F.R. § 1.83 further states that conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for an understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the form of a graphical symbol or a labeled representation.

Applicant submits that the drawings show every feature of invention specified in the claims. Applicant further submits that 37 C.F.R. § 1.83, by the use of the word should, clearly states that there is no requirement for labeling a box or symbol. Further the MPEP is devoid of any instruction to label a box or symbol.

Also, the labeling of the figures of the present application is consistent with the labeling of the figures of Patent No. 6,657,998, the specification and figures of which are substantially the same as the present application.

In view of the fact that the burden for labeling the boxes is large and that labeling is not a requirement, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for having unlabeled rectangular boxes (see above). For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Examiner further objected to Fig. 75C for having a missing left side of element 20059. Applicant downloaded Fig. 75C from the USPTO PAIR site and was unable to identify a

missing left side of element 20059. Applicant also downloaded Fig. 75C as printed in Publication 2002-0031117 which also showed a complete element 20059. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Fig. 75C.

Applicant has amended the Brief Description of the Drawings on pages 13, 14 and 17 of the specification as shown on page 2 of the Amendment to: (1) correct Fig. 28A to read Fig. 28B, (2) correct Fig. 33A-D to read Figs. 33A-F and (3) has added a brief description of Figs. 56A-D.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 22-42 under the judicially created doctrine of obvious type double patenting over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,657,998. The Examiner stated that a timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321 may be used to overcome the actual or provisional rejection providing the conflicting patent is shown to be commonly owned.

A Terminal Disclaimer and Statement of Common Ownership signed by Applicant's registered attorney of record is attached herewith. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection of claims 22-42.

Conclusion

Insofar as the Examiner's objections and rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application, including claims 22-42, is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 22-42 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SHUO-YEN ROBERT LI

June 8, 2005
(Date)

By: _____


LOUIS SICKLES II

Registration No. 45,803

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1294

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: lsickles@akingump.com

LS:lcd